

10

An Archaeologist on the Schliemann Controversy*

WOLFGANG SCHINDLER

I

Heinrich Schliemann (1822–1890) was a product of the nineteenth century who remains unforgotten today. It is remarkable that until the early 1970s he was admired in precisely the way which he had sought in his own lifetime. For decades, for almost a century, his accomplishments were repeatedly praised. He had risen from the most modest origins to become a man of great wealth and the companion of kings, queens, an emperor and the Prime Minister of England. And, as the excavator of Troy and Mycenae, he became the founder of a new scholarly discipline, modern archaeology, that is field-archaeology. Along with Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717–1768), the founder of archaeology as art history, a permanent place of honor has been reserved for him in the history of scholarship.¹

I wish to state at the start that this place of honor will never be denied him, not even by those who, since the 150th birthday of Schliemann, began to interpret critically his autobiographical writings. The new impetus thus given to Schliemann research, its discoveries and the resulting controversies, which the American archaeologist Machteld Mellinck in 1985 termed “psychological warfare against Schliemann,”² will be the center of my address.

For my part I do not speak as an uncommitted observer. I am involved in these controversies. The disagreements aroused by them have by no means subsided. The best proofs of this assertion are the two international conferences, one held at Bad Homburg in December 1989 and the other at Athens during Easter 1990, in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of

*An earlier version of this paper was delivered at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign as the second Oldfather Lecture on 7 September 1990.

¹ This place in the history of his discipline was not disputed by his first critic: see W. M. Calder III, “Schliemann on Schliemann: A Study in the Use of Sources,” *GRBS* 13 (1972) 335–53.

² M. J. Mellinck, *AJA* 89 (1985) 553.

Schliemann's death.³ I shall evaluate the results of the first two conferences here.

II

To better understand the two conferences it will be useful to sketch briefly the progress of Schliemann research during the 70s and 80s. Before the early 70s, when attention was directed to the life and work of this man, it meant admiration for his accomplishments and trust in his writings.⁴ For the brilliant impulse to a new evaluation of the man which the famous Jewish biographer Emil Ludwig had presented in his Schliemann life of 1932⁵ had been forgotten. The whitewashing of the hero demanded by Nazi ideologists, and carried out by the Mecklenburg schoolmaster Ernst Meyer, had destroyed the opportunity for an historical view of Schliemann for more than forty years. How very much this process was influenced by Meyer's biography⁶ and his editions of selected letters⁷ (that is, the sources) was made clear by W. M. Calder in his Bad Homburg paper.⁸ No defender of Meyer in this regard has yet emerged, if one ignores the swarm of uncritical Schliemann defenders who preserve the picture of Meyer's hero that has now become canonical and deny every critical attack against it.⁹

A decisive new impetus for a realistic conception of the context in which Schliemann constructed his understanding of himself began with the now legendary midnight lecture in the pastor's house in Neubukow on 6 January 1972, the 150th birthday of Heinrich Schliemann. It was given by

³ Bad Homburg: Heinrich Schliemann nach 100 Jahren: Symposium in der Werner-Reimers-Stiftung Bad Homburg 5-9 December 1989; Athens: Archaeology and Heinrich Schliemann a Century after his Death, International Congress in Athens, 14-22 April 1990. A third congress was held at Berlin 3-6 December 1990: see *Resümées zur internationalen Tagung: Heinrich Schliemann: Grundlagen und Ergebnisse moderner Archäologie. 100 Jahre nach Schliemanns Tod vom 3. bis 16. Dezember 1990 in Berlin* (Berlin 1990).

⁴ Proof of this continued admiration for Schliemann and his accomplishments among much else is H. A. Stoll, *Der Traum von Troja: Lebensroman Heinrich Schliemanns* (Leipzig 1956).

⁵ Emil Ludwig, *Schliemann: Geschichte eines Goldsuchers* (Berlin-Vienna-Leipzig 1932); reprinted with changed title as *Schliemann: Die Geschichte der Entdeckung des Alten Troja* (Bern 1952).

⁶ E. Meyer, *Heinrich Schliemann: Kaufmann und Forscher* (Göttingen 1969). Typically, no critical review of the book exists.

⁷ E. Meyer, *Briefe von Heinrich Schliemann* (Berlin-Leipzig 1936) and *Heinrich Schliemann, Briefwechsel I* (Berlin 1953); II (Berlin 1958).

⁸ W. M. Calder III, "Apocolocyntosis: The Biographers and the Archaeologists," *Heinrich Schliemann nach 100 Jahren*, ed. W. M. Calder III and J. Cobet (Frankfurt/Main 1990) 360-78.

⁹ See for example E. F. Bloedow, "Schliemann on his Accusers," *Tyche* 1 (1986) 30-40; "Schliemann on his Accusers II: A Study in the Reuse of Sources," *L'Antiquité Classique* 57 (1988) 5-30; "Schliemann at Mycenae," *Classical Views* 8 (1989) 147-65.

Professor W. M. Calder III, a leading pioneer of the new Schliemann research.¹⁰ The lecture was delivered by Calder after Heinrich Alexander Stoll (the Schliemann biographer) had earlier on the same evening in the Marktgaströte presented the official anniversary address.¹¹

What was exciting and new was that Calder under the title "Schliemann on Schliemann"¹² first checked critically what Schliemann wrote about himself. First he looked at what Schliemann said and then sought to control it by adducing independent contemporary sources. What emerged was exciting. The historicity of "The Dream of Troy" was put in doubt.¹³ Schliemann maintained that already in his childhood in Ankershagen, where he lived from the age of two until nine, he had sharpened his pick and spade to dig out Troy. Already in these youthful years he had formed the plan later to excavate Troy and his whole life long had pursued this dream. Suddenly this was no longer the truth. On February 2nd of the same year in Berlin voices were raised that doubted the historicity of the Dream of Troy during a colloquium held at the Academy there.¹⁴

To this youthful romance belonged the tale of his love for Minna Meincke, his young playmate, whose role Schliemann later exaggerated.¹⁵ What was most striking was the fact that in Rostock there existed no dissertation written in ancient Greek with which in 1869 Schliemann could have earned his doctorate.¹⁶ There was only a *vita* of about eight pages written in Greek, Latin and French. The latter was part of his book about Ithaca, the Peloponnesus and Troy.¹⁷ This publication served as the dissertation and secured the degree.

With these fancies were found others. Calder proved that the granting of Schliemann's U.S. citizenship did not occur in 1850 but in 1869.¹⁸ Further, the visit to President Fillmore at the White House 21 February 1851 in fact never took place but was made up by Schliemann and inserted into his diary.¹⁹ Apparently his visit with the Governor of Panama was similarly an invention.²⁰

¹⁰ The address, first delivered in German, was published in English; see above, note 1.

¹¹ At the request of the audience H. A. Stoll read aloud selections from his book *Der Traum von Troja*.

¹² See above, note 1.

¹³ Calder (above, note 1) 343 f.

¹⁴ The views advanced by J. Herrmann at this colloquium were incorporated into his book, *Heinrich Schliemann: Wegbereiter einer neuen Wissenschaft* (Berlin 1974) 9.

¹⁵ Calder (above, note 1) 344 f.

¹⁶ Calder (above, note 1) 336 f.

¹⁷ Heinrich Schliemann, *Ithaque, le Péloponnèse, Troie: Recherches archéologiques* (Paris 1869) = *Ithaka, der Peloponnes und Troja* (Leipzig 1869; repr. Darmstadt 1973).

¹⁸ Calder (above, note 1) 337 f.

¹⁹ Calder (above, note 1) 338 ff.

²⁰ Calder (above, note 1) 342.

Calder had very quickly carried his discoveries to the point that he called Schliemann "a pathological liar."²¹ He meant a man who lied by nature, who could not distinguish between true and false. This conclusion enraged the defenders of Schliemann, who soon entered the discussion. One has the impression that not all of them were really clear as to what the expression, "pathological liar," meant. Because Calder had bestowed this title on the hero Schliemann, the controversy burst forth in all its virulence.²²

I rather inclined to an historical explanation for what Schliemann had done rather than a psychological one, in part probably because I am a European and not an American. I sought to explain the fabrications and distortions of fact in Schliemann's narrative as a symptom of his *Sitz im Leben*.²³ At first I was convinced that one must see Schliemann's great efforts and persistence to excavate Hisarlik as a part of this creative fantasy-world. But I saw later that, along with his archaeological energy, his businessman's insistence quickly to reach his goal also played a decisive role. As far as the identification of Hisarlik with Troy goes, we know now that he owes this entirely to Frank Calvert, an Englishman who served as American Consul in the Dardanelles and had purchased part of Hisarlik with the intention of excavating it.²⁴ But at the end it was Schliemann who dug through the various levels and began the excavation on a scale which Calvert simply could not have managed.

Calder's discoveries were to be carried further. Professor David A. Traill of the University of California at Davis succeeded in proving that Schliemann's alleged eyewitness account of the burning of San Francisco on the night of 3-4 June 1851 was a fiction based on a Sacramento newspaper account.²⁵ He further showed that his allegation that he had to leave Sacramento suddenly because of illness in March 1852 was untrue. In fact he had been shortweighting his partner's gold and was found out.²⁶ Traill later confirmed from contemporary sources that Schliemann's American

²¹ Calder (above, note 1) 352.

²² See W. Schindler, "Dichtung und Wahrheit: Schliemanns Selbstbiographie im Kontext," in Calder and Cobet (above, note 8) 152 n. 1 for bibliography.

²³ W. Schindler, "Heinrich Schliemann: Leben und Werk im Spiegel der neueren biographischen Forschungen," *Philologus* 120 (1976) 271-89 and in Calder and Cobet (above, note 8) 152-69.

²⁴ D. A. Traill, "Further Evidence of Fraudulent Reporting in Schliemann's Archaeological Works," *Boreas* 7 (1984) 295-316. Already in his memorial address on 1 March 1891 R. Virchow had alluded to the independence of Schliemann from F. Calvert in locating Troy at Hisarlik; see J. Herrmann, *Heinrich Schliemann: Wegbereiter einer neuen Wissenschaft*² (Berlin 1990) 251 n. 7.

²⁵ D. A. Traill, "Schliemann's Mendacity: Fire and Fever in California," *CJ* 74 (1979) 348-55.

²⁶ See previous note.

citizenship and Indianapolis divorce in 1869 were gained through bribery, misrepresentation and perjury.²⁷

In this way the outlines of the picture began to take on a clearer form. All these inventions of Schliemann fit beautifully the image of the self-made man. He presented himself to his audience as the perfect social climber, the romantic parvenu, at the same time as the successful businessman and fortunate adventurer. In his anger Traill brought the verdict of moral condemnation against Schliemann. In his contribution to the Colorado volume on "Schliemann's Helios Metope and Psychopathic Tendencies" he applied to Schliemann's life the symptoms of psychopathy derived from the *Encyclopedia of Human Behavior* and explained all his peculiarities in terms of mental illness.²⁸ Unfortunately, this paper has damaged the critical investigation of Schliemann. In spite of Traill's invaluable contributions to our understanding of the historical Schliemann, one simply must admit this. The reaction of the press confirms my assertion.²⁹ This medical diagnosis of Schliemann as far as scholarship goes has reached a dead end. Nonetheless, now as before, as one could see in both the Homburg and Athens conferences, the Schliemann phenomenon has remained a favorite wrestling arena for psychologists and psychoanalysts.³⁰

III

Meanwhile, there has been continued progress in the understanding of the cultural milieu of Schliemann's life, of the period during which he made his business career and began his excavations. The Homburg Symposium has added a great deal to our knowledge here. German enthusiasm for Homer in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has been carefully investigated. Professor Wohlleben spoke on the subject at Bad Homburg and at the University of Illinois.³¹ One must understand Schliemann's love for

²⁷ D. A. Traill, "Schliemann's American Citizenship and Divorce," *CJ* 77 (1982) 336-42.

²⁸ D. A. Traill, "Schliemann's Acquisition of the Helios Metope and his Psychopathic Tendencies," *Myth, Scandal and History: The Heinrich Schliemann Controversy and a First Edition of the Mycenaean Diary*, ed. W. M. Calder III and D. A. Traill (Detroit 1986) 48-80, esp. 62-73.

²⁹ Note particularly the attacks of Bloedow (above, note 9) and D. Easton, "Schliemann's Discovery of 'Priam's Treasure': Two Enigmas," *Antiquity* 55 (1981) 179-83 and "Schliemann's Mendacity: A False Traill?" *Antiquity* 58 (1984) 197-204.

³⁰ S. Goldmann, "Die Homerische Welt als Symbol verschütteter Kindheit: Literaturpsychoanalytische Untersuchung von Heinrich Schliemanns Autobiographie (1869)," in Calder and Cobet (above, note 8) 191-205.

³¹ See J. Wohlleben, "Homer in German Classicism: Goethe, Friedrich Schlegel, Hölderlin and Schelling," *ICS* 15 (1990) 197-211 and *Die Sonne Homers: Zehn Kapitel deutscher Homer-Begeisterung von Winckelmann bis Schliemann* (Göttingen 1990). This latter is an expansion of Calder and Cobet (above, note 8) 27-30.

Homer as part of this tradition, although Schliemann himself had no interest in the aesthetic appreciation of Homer. For him Homer was poetry with a kernel of real history which he believed one could discover archaeologically.

The reception of ancient history in Europe at this time played a decisive role. History was seen to be a medium for self-description. The quest for historical reality was practiced on a wide scale, not least in the matter of archaeological confirmation. This was articulated at Homburg up to the point of explaining the history of archaeology as "Myth and Sensation."³² With his search for Troy Schliemann is a typical example, also in regard to the historical coloring of his own existence. Think only of his domestic life in the Iliou Melathron, his residence at Athens, where he lived with his children Agamemnon and Andromache.

Schliemann's approach to ancient history in his formative decades was also elucidated at Bad Homburg from the side of art history.³³ Realistic historical description to the point of creating a model for self-identification in place of the earlier classicistic and romantic conceptions was stressed. This agrees with the contemporary patterns of historical description. We find an allegorical variant on this in the painted *putti* of the Iliou Melathron, who are portrayed engaged in the very pursuits of Schliemann and Sophia.³⁴

Nineteenth-century jewelry and the harmless imitation of ancient pieces were carefully discussed at Bad Homburg.³⁵ Schliemann's intention to have an exact copy of his Trojan treasures made in Paris (this is attested by his letter to Beaurain in Paris) fit easily into such a context, but they are not proof that an object such as the so-called Mask of Agamemnon is a forgery buried by Schliemann at Mycenae. Unfortunately Calder and Traill were a bit too bold in this regard.³⁶ The two requests to have scientific tests of the mask made were both refused. Greek national pride here understandably played a role.

³² See B. Patzek, "Schliemann und die Geschichte der Archäologie im neunzehnten Jahrhundert," in Calder and Cobet (above, note 8) 311–55.

³³ See H. Hammer-Schenk, "Das Bild der griechischen Antike in der Malerei um die Mitte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts," in Calder and Cobet (above, note 8) 335–45.

³⁴ See S. Tarantou, "Iliou Melathron," *Katoikia* 30 (1987) 68–75; G. S. Korres, *Das Altertum* 34 (1988) 164–73 and "Heinrich Schliemanns 'Iliou Melathron' in Athen," *Antike Welt* 19.1 (1988) 62–64.

³⁵ See C. Gere and G. C. Munn, *Artists' Jewellery, Pre-Raphaelite to Arts and Crafts* (Woodbridge 1989) and G. C. Munn, "The Archaeologist, the Collector and the Jeweller, 1820–1900," in Calder and Cobet (above, note 8) 326–34. One may add now that in September 1879 Schliemann ordered from Carlo Giuliano in London "einen Halschmuck und ein Armband" as gifts for Virchow's daughter: see J. Herrmann and E. Maaß (edd.), *Die Korrespondenz zwischen Heinrich Schliemann und Rudolf Virchow 1876–90* (Berlin 1990) 142, where for "Ginliano" read "Giuliano."

³⁶ See "CU Prof seeks to debunk legend: Famous mask may be fake, too," *Colorado Daily* 30 Nr. 239 (12 October 1982); "Archaeological Liar: Scholars discredit archaeologist's fantastic legend," *Rocky Mountain News* (15 February 1982) 6; and D. A. Traill, "Priam's Treasure: Schliemann's Plan to Make Duplicates for Illicit Purposes," in Calder and Traill (above, note 28) 110–21.

A further important point to come out of the Homburg Conference was the idea of a "collective biography" of the middle class between 1850 and 1870.³⁷ The economic success and scholarly and cultural interests of this class were stressed. These factors were not only inherent in Schliemann's life, but they colored above anything else the repeated claims found in his autobiography, which became a mirror of these inclinations. Hans-Werner Hahn, a specialist in nineteenth-century intellectual history, observed:³⁸

The fact is that numerous aspects of this biography are to be brought into close contact with the general development of the bourgeoisie. That goes for the economic rise of the "self-made man" as well as for the early joining of business activity and scholarly and cultural interests, the meaning of bourgeois work ethic and efficiency, the mixing of progressive optimism with the fear of crisis, the reforming of one's own life-goals as a result of economic crisis and the reversion to the past that was connected with this.

Along with the historical examination of autobiography, an attempt was made to understand from the point of view of the history of literature Schliemann's autobiographical assertions.³⁹ The interesting observation was made that two genres of autobiography must be distinguished. There is biographical information presented after the life was lived. There is also the autobiography that is programmatically conceived, written as motivation for what has not yet been realized. This was so in the case of Schliemann.

IV

In this context lie too those earliest revelations of Schliemann in which he sought to work through his early years. The great document for this is his still not fully published monster-letter of 1842 to his sisters. It is in the Gennadeion Library of the American School in Athens and is over sixty pages in length. In his edition of the selected correspondence Ernst Meyer published much of the letter.⁴⁰ But its usefulness suffered from his censorship. We are not certain that Schliemann ever sent it.

I sought with very few exceptions to edit those parts of the letter omitted by Meyer and with this new information to determine the parallels between the letter and the *topoi* of contemporary literature, particularly

³⁷ See H. Scheuer, "Heinrich Schliemanns 'Selbstbiographie': Zur Gattungstypologie der Autobiographik in der zweiten Hälfte des neunzehnten Jahrhundert," in Calder and Cobet (above, note 8) 346-59.

³⁸ See his contribution, "Wirtschaftliche Erfolge und wissenschaftlichkulturelle Interessen: Entwicklungsprozesse im mitteleuropäische Bürgertum vor dem Hintergrund der Biographie Heinrich Schliemanns," in Calder and Cobet (above, note 8) 309-25 (citation from 323).

³⁹ Contribution to the discussion by J. Wohlleben after the paper of H. Scheuer (above, note 37).

⁴⁰ E. Meyer, *Briefwechsel I* (above, note 7) 9-33.

trivial-literature.⁴¹ For example, the topos of the portrayal of women: Schliemann portrays them on the one hand as romantic fairytale figures, but on the other hand with crassest realism. One need only cite the description of Sophie Schwartz, the Ankershagen housemaid and lover of his father who brought so much misfortune to his early life. He describes her in a way that stresses the vulgarity of this poor wretch.⁴² Alleging that he met her in Hamburg, he gives her a defense speech in which one finds a lofty level of moral and philosophical argument of a sort she never could have used.⁴³ This is a further topos that can be paralleled in contemporary literature and sermons.

Further it is noteworthy—I have sought to show that in his description of the shipwreck off Texel—that Schliemann, in spite of all his attention to detail, a trait of the successful businessman, nonetheless is able to vary the report of what he experienced. In this regard one should compare the version of his letter to his sisters in 1842⁴⁴ with the version of the shipwreck in his autobiography of 1880 in *Ilios*.⁴⁵ There are considerable discrepancies of such magnitude that one thinks of a dramatic composition rather than the reporting of what really happened.⁴⁶

Comparable was the critical analysis of the editing of the book about China and Japan which he submitted as part of material for his doctorate in Rostock in 1869. When one compares the text of the diary of 1865 with the published version, there are similar discrepancies, omissions and changes.⁴⁷ Unfortunately the guide books used by Schliemann could not be compared with his narrative and so we do not know how much he owed to them.

In another case such a comparison was revealing. In *BSA* 1989 David Turner compared the Ithaca book with which Schliemann received his doctorate with the diary and with Murray's guidebook.⁴⁸ It turned out that Schliemann combined what he had recorded in his diary with what he read in

⁴¹ W. Schindler in Calder and Cobet (above, note 8) 161 f.

⁴² W. Schindler (previous note) 157 f.

⁴³ W. Schindler (above, note 41) 160.

⁴⁴ E. Meyer, *Briefwechsel* I (above, note 7) 22–24.

⁴⁵ Heinrich Schliemann, *Ilios: Stadt und Land der Trojaner* (Leipzig 1881) 9 f. There exists an external confirmation for the shipwreck from the Dutch side: see *The Americanization of Edward Bok: The Autobiography of a Dutch Boy Fifty Years After* (New York 1922) xxi–xxii. Bok relates how a relative of his had rescued the boy Schliemann on the beach at Texel.

⁴⁶ W. Schindler (above, note 41) 162–64.

⁴⁷ See P. Keyser, "The Composition of *La Chine et le Japon*: An Introduction to Tendentious Editing," in Calder and Cobet (above, note 8) 225–36.

⁴⁸ See M. Lehrer and D. Turner, "The Making of an Homeric Archaeologist: Schliemann's Diary of 1868," *BSA* 84 (1989) 221–68.

the guidebook to create a third version. Heinrich Alexander Stoll, the Schliemann biographer, in the year 1973 wrote to Calder:⁴⁹

The Ithaca-book expresses more the *Wunschbild* than what Schliemann really experienced . . . Please look at the names borne by the citizens of Ithaca, who enter into Schliemann's narrative . . . The whole book is not a diary about Ithaca. It is a novel. One might easily say the same about *La Chine et le Japon*.

Let Stoll have the last word until further research determines the relation of his early publications with the diary entries and guidebooks.

V

Calder in 1972 in his pioneer article, "Schliemann on Schliemann," already asked the question, "How did his psychopathy affect his archaeology?"⁵⁰ This opened a new field for investigation. Traill followed the suggestion and pointed his finger to a weak point of central importance, namely to the various archaeological reports by Schliemann concerning the Treasure of Priam.⁵¹ With this treasure he had crowned his first Trojan campaign (1871–73). The first suspicious discrepancy which Traill found was Schliemann's allegation that Sophia was at Troy and shared in the discovery of the treasure. It can be proven (Schliemann later admitted it) that at this time she had already returned to Athens.⁵² With the exposure of this fiction in Schliemann, the Treasure itself fell under suspicion. Sophia had been inserted as an eyewitness for what she never saw. Comparison of the report of the find in the Trojan diary with the letter to his publisher Brockhaus and the published version of the excavations revealed that first only in Athens after the completion of the campaign did he write up the description of the whole Treasure. Traill hastened to present Schliemann in the light of a forger.⁵³ The excavator of Troy had possibly purchased new pieces or even had them made. The "warfare" against Schliemann had been carried so far that his scholarly reputation was now in jeopardy.

Finally at this point the defenders of Schliemann entered the arena. They were determined not only to contain the vilifications of Schliemann but to refute them.⁵⁴ Now these tendencies too have reached inflationary

⁴⁹ See W. M. Calder III (above, note 8) 374 f.

⁵⁰ Calder (above, note 1) 349.

⁵¹ D. A. Traill, "Schliemann's Discovery of 'Priam's Treasure'," *Antiquity* 57 (1983) 181–86 and "Schliemann's Discovery of Priam's Treasure: A Reexamination of the Evidence," *JHS* 104 (1984) 96–115.

⁵² Traill, *JHS* 104 (1984) 109 f.

⁵³ Traill, *JHS* 104 (1984) 114 f. and "Priam's Treasure" (above, note 36) 116.

⁵⁴ See especially D. Easton, "Schliemann's Discovery" (above, note 29); "Schliemann's Mendacity" (above, note 29); and "Priam's Treasure," *Anat. St.* 34 (1984) 141–69.

level.⁵⁵ Instead of providing a catalogue of all these excesses, exaggerations, unjustified allegations and accusations, matters which particularly in the last years of our century provide unwelcome evidence for the hysteria of so-called objective scholarship, instead of adding to this, I should like to report a debate from the recent Homburg Conference. Its results serve to clarify the ambivalence of the arguments pro and contra Heinrich Schliemann.

It is a matter here of the *rencontre* between David Traill and the Cambridge defender of Schliemann, Donald Easton. Traill had accused Schliemann of unscrupulously planting together pieces from the 1872 and 1878 excavations.⁵⁶ This seemed to him to be a further example of Schliemann's deceit. Easton put his finger again on this passage and could show that Schliemann had put together objects from different excavations in Troy without maintaining that he had excavated them at the same time. The duel between the two scholars ended fairly and exemplified English fair play. The indictment was unsuccessful and the trial ended with the Scots' verdict "not proven."

This discussion once again showed how careful one must be when interpreting what Schliemann says in order to avoid repeated and unprovable accusations. Some critics and defenders of Schliemann have extended the "psychological warfare" pro and contra Schliemann to a similar campaign against one another. It would be beneficial for everyone if as part of the 100th anniversary of Schliemann's death all these exaggerations, which have their positive side, could be reduced to a justifiable dimension. The first steps toward a reduction took place at the Schliemann Congress in Athens during Easter 1990 in which I participated. I shall return to these results later.

VI

I want to add a further example intended to illustrate how careful we must be in Schliemann research. The example brings us back to his autobiography. It is concerned with the dissertation written in ancient Greek with which he supposedly gained his doctorate at the University of Rostock in 1869.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ See especially the writings of Bloedow (above, note 9).

⁵⁶ See H. Schmidt, *Heinrich Schliemanns Sammlung Trojanischer Altertümer* (Berlin 1902) 245 (N); H. Schliemann, *Trojanische Altertümer: Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Troja* (Leipzig 1874) 117 = (1990) 102 and *Ilios* (above, note 45) 547. Compare Easton, "Schliemann's Mendacity" (above, note 29) 201 and D. A. Traill, "Heinrich Schliemann," *Classical Scholarship: A Biographical Encyclopedia*, ed. W. W. Briggs and W. M. Calder III (New York-London 1990) 436: "If it was found as Schliemann reports, it must have been planted." Easton defends Schliemann against the accusation that he planted finds of 1872 to be found again in 1878.

⁵⁷ Schliemann, *Ilios* (above, note 45) 24 f. For the Latin *vita* accompanying the dissertation, see W. M. Calder III, "Heinrich Schliemann, An Unpublished Latin *Vita*," *CW*

Calder searched for this Greek dissertation and concluded that it had never existed. What he found were two more or less eight-page autobiographies composed in Latin and Greek. In fact they were translations of the original French life in the Ithaca book that earned him the doctorate. Calder seemed to be right with his exciting discovery that the "dissertation written in ancient Greek" was a fiction.⁵⁸

If one investigates the matter more carefully, one finds that the myth of the Greek dissertation arose gradually. In the first autobiography of 1880 that begins *Ilios*, Schliemann writes of the Ithaca book:⁵⁹

One copy of this work along with a dissertation written in ancient Greek I sent in to the University of Rostock and was rewarded by being granted the degree of doctor of philosophy of that university.

That at this time by the word dissertation Schliemann meant, rather than the actual thesis with which he gained his degree, a kind of written proof of his knowledge of Greek, one sees in his letter to the American Philological Association, written from Indianapolis on 29 May 1869. There he discusses the correct way to learn a foreign language. He writes:⁶⁰

[It is necessary] to read much aloud, never to make translations, to write always dissertations on subjects that interest us.

In the same letter he speaks of a sixth-form boy who masters classical Greek in twelve months. The boy has

to write fluently a tolerably good dissertation and to translate—unprepared—any one of the classical Greek authors . . .

Clearly "dissertation" here means a written proof of linguistic competence. One must obviously ask why Schliemann did not speak of the dissertation written in Latin as well as the one in Greek. With use of the word "dissertation" he must have known that in German-speaking countries there would be a misunderstanding. Readers would naturally assume that the thesis itself was written in ancient Greek. Carl Schuchhardt, in his famous book, translated into English, on Schliemann's excavations, still in 1890 distinguishes the Ithaca book from "a treatise written in ancient Greek."⁶¹

67 (1973/74) 271–82 with corrections at CW 69 (1975/76) 117–18. The Greek *Vita* remains unpublished.

⁵⁸ Calder (above, note 1) 336 f.

⁵⁹ Schliemann, *Ilios* (above, note 45) 24 f.

⁶⁰ E. Meyer, *Briefwechsel I* (above, note 7) 154 and 155.

⁶¹ C. Schuchhardt, *Schliemann's Ausgrabungen in Troja, Tiryns, Mykenä, Orchomenos, Ithaka im Licht der heutigen Wissenschaft* (Leipzig 1890) 9.

Emil Ludwig in 1932 first spoke of "a *biography* written in ancient Greek."⁶²

Professor Bachmann, instructed by the Dean Hermann Karsten to evaluate the Ithaca book, wrote as well about the Greek autobiography which he tore to pieces (the Latin *vita* he approved). He wrote of the Ithaca book:⁶³

... the efforts of Mr. Schliemann on archaeological and topographical matters, by which he worthily continues his learned predecessors, apart from several criticisms of details, are so noteworthy that I have no hesitation to vote for the awarding of the doctoral degree.

It is a half truth if one allows Schliemann to gain his doctorate on the basis of a dissertation written in ancient Greek. Calder's criticism must be corrected in that Schliemann used the word dissertation to mean a linguistic exercise rather than a thesis. If this exercise had in fact been his thesis, he would have failed miserably. He did not quite lie but he wrote ambiguously.

VII

With this problem, which may serve as a further example to warn against too quick a criticism of Schliemann, we find ourselves again in the midst of the biographical quarrels for and against Schliemann. At Bad Homburg Calder critically examined the efforts of the three leading Schliemann biographers: the already mentioned life by Emil Ludwig (1932), next that of Ernst Meyer (1969) and finally the biographical novel by Heinrich Alexander Stoll (1956).⁶⁴

Calder expressed the highest admiration for the pioneer, critical work of Emil Ludwig, who was the founder of our modern understanding of the *Lebensproblematik* of Schliemann. He sought on the one hand to clarify the enormous influence of Ludwig on the historical biographical literature of his time. He explained his success through the discarding of historicism because of his conception of cultural history. That is a breakthrough which Calder had already detected in the distancing between Wilamowitz and his great pupils, especially Paul Friedländer and Werner Jaeger. Emil Ludwig similarly belonged to the generation after historicism, who, although they made use of that movement, advanced to new horizons of cultural history by seeking a deeper understanding of their subject.

⁶² Ludwig (above, note 5) 124: "In der Tat dürfte der Indigohändler als erster, ohne doch Alphilologe zu sein, auf dieser Universität mit einem altgriechisch geschriebenen Lebenslauf promoviert worden sein."

⁶³ H. A. Stoll, *Der Traum von Troja*¹⁰ (Leipzig 1974) 268 = *Der Traum von Troja*⁶ (Halle-Leipzig 1990) 250.

⁶⁴ E. Ludwig (above, note 5); E. Meyer (above, note 8), H. A. Stoll (above, note 4).

On the other hand Calder discovered a sharing of deep similarities between Ludwig and Schliemann that went so far that he described Ludwig's Schliemann biography as an *apologia pro vita sua*.⁶⁵ The amateur Ludwig, attacked by the professors of history, saw in Schliemann, attacked by the German professors of his time, an anticipation of his own predicament. Not everyone will accept this suggestion. What seems to me more important is the stressing of the brutal realism in Ludwig's biography. He had scratched the heroic portrait of the founder of modern archaeology. The reaction of the archaeologists was immediate. Theodor Wiegand wrote to Wilhelm Dörpfeld on 17 May 1932:⁶⁶

I have read the Schliemann-book of Ludwig and find it disgusting. Was it necessary to stress so many little unattractive traits in the life of the man? And on the other hand he is supposed to be a hero . . . I absolutely cannot understand Mrs. Schliemann. She certainly has served poorly the memory of her husband. Quite the opposite.

Calder remarks about this: "The scholar Wiegand prefers myth to truth!"⁶⁷ Such an opinion reveals the similarity between the way Calder and Ludwig approach their hero. Certainly Ludwig's biography had breached the fortress of Schliemann's admirers. The reason Ludwig's results had such little influence on subsequent research lay in the problem of Germany in the 1930s. After the establishment of National Socialism in Germany in 1933, the work of the Jew Emil Ludwig, born Cohn, was ignored and disparaged and the need arose to whitewash the damaged image of the hero Schliemann.

The biographer that was needed was quickly discovered. He was Dr. Ernst Meyer, since 1919 a teacher at a boys' school in Neustrelitz-Mecklenburg. He was relieved of his teaching duties in 1937 and given the task of freeing Schliemann from the slanders of the Jew Ludwig. Meyer worked for some time in Athens and had access to the Schliemann papers (by then in the Gennadeion there). This is why he knows the sources so well and in some ways this aided further research. Take for example Meyer's, admittedly problematic, editions of selected letters. We can read about him in a Mecklenburg newspaper of 31 May 1937:⁶⁸

The schoolteacher Dr. Ernst Meyer of Mecklenburg has been in Athens for some time, commissioned by the Reichsstatthalter and Gauleiter, Friedrich Hildebrandt, to set in order the papers of the famous archaeologist and Trojan expert Heinrich Schliemann . . .

From the whole *Nachlaß* there can be gained a reliable and thoroughly documented portrait of Schliemann that is free from the misrepresentations which are found for example in the biography of

⁶⁵ Calder (above, note 8) 365.

⁶⁶ Calder (above, note 8) 368; cf. E. Meyer, *Schliemann* (above, note 6) 426 n. 98.

⁶⁷ Calder (above, note 8) 368.

⁶⁸ Calder (above, note 8) 370, citing *Landeszeitung für Mecklenburg Beilage zu Nr. 123* (31 May 1937).

Emil Ludwig Cohn, entitled *The Goldseeker*, and based on capitalistic conceptions.

The critical insights into Schliemann's life, begun by Ludwig, were blocked by the whitewashing of Ernst Meyer. The quarrel about the "Goldseeker Schliemann" was never the turning point that it ought to have been. Meyer fully discarded this approach to the man, and writes that he misses wholly in Ludwig⁶⁹

the organ for the German in Schliemann, particularly for his romantic idealism. Ludwig lacks entirely (one need only look at the humorous introductory sentences of his biography) the feeling for the unique values of the people of Mecklenburg and of the Low German landscape.

These aims of Ernst Meyer which may also be traced in his appendix to the new editions of Schliemann's autobiography, are perhaps too strongly stressed by Calder. But at Bad Homburg his views were not attacked. And who would dare to defend Meyer in this context?

In contrast Calder places the writer Heinrich Alexander Stoll on a higher level. This admiration of Stoll lies partly in the fact that for years the two communicated both orally and in letters. I myself was a witness of this and can only confirm it. Calder for the first time presented to the public at Bad Homburg the letter, cited earlier, to him of 8 October 1973.⁷⁰ This letter attests clearly the distance gained in the 1970s by Stoll from the romantic elaborations of Schliemann's life. In his notes to his *Dream of Troy*, certainly by the tenth edition of 1974, he writes clearly:⁷¹

The earliest autobiography of Schliemann, the foreword to *Ithaka, der Peloponnes und Troja*, 1869, is more spontaneous than the one in *Ilios* and not yet written from the summit of his greatness and as proof that all experienced and attained had been anticipated from the beginning. From this need, many of the romantic elaborations certainly resulted.

The critical attitude of Stoll regarding Schliemann's descriptions crystalized in the 1970s, years that were decisive for Schliemann research. In the introduction which Stoll wrote to Schliemann's Ithaca-book in 1974 we find the following critical formulation:⁷²

The modern reader too . . . will be inclined to add critical question marks and surprised exclamation points in the margins. In a number of places he will have serious doubts whether a real diary has been published or a romanticized reworking by an otherwise sober businessman which allows him to see and hear things belonging more

⁶⁹ Calder (above, note 8) 371 and E. Meyer, *Briefe* (above, note 7) 25, 49 n. 1.

⁷⁰ Calder (above, note 8) 374 f. The Calder-Stoll correspondence is now in the archives of the Heinrich Schliemann Museum at Ankershagen.

⁷¹ H. A. Stoll, *Der Traum von Troja*¹⁰ (Leipzig 1974) 544.

⁷² H. A. Stoll, *Auf den Spuren der Antike: Heinrich Schliemanns Berichte über seine Entdeckungen in der griechischen Welt* (Berlin 1974) 26.

to his imagination and wish-fulfilment than to the sober reality of Ithacan daily life.

David Turner's critical analysis of the Ithaca book, published in the *Annual of the British School at Athens* of 1989,⁷³ is the best proof of Stoll's suspicions. One can, therefore, only agree with Calder's high estimation of Stoll's service in investigating Schliemann's writings and hope that these first critical steps will be permanently acknowledged especially in the balancing of research in this anniversary year.

The first steps in this direction have already been made by Wilfried Bölke, the Director of the Schliemann Museum in Ankershagen-Mecklenburg.⁷⁴ But that was not the theme of his contribution to the Homburg Colloquium. He spoke there rather of new sources that can clarify the years of Schliemann's childhood and apprenticeship.⁷⁵ They especially concern the role of Schliemann's father in Ankershagen and their effect on the early education of his son. With the interpretation of these new sources we have gained a fresh insight into Schliemann's conception of his father. That allows us to grasp more profoundly the childhood pattern and the motivation for his restless energy.

VIII

If we seek to survey the work on Schliemann from the seventies until the anniversary year 1990, we can distinguish the following currents.

Further critical attention to the autobiographical assertions continues unabated. New sources are always becoming available. The hasty critical attacks have become milder and more careful. Out of the allegedly notorious deceiver the self-made man of the *Gründerzeit* has emerged. His businessman's cleverness and brilliant gift for public relations have been understood in the light of his historical and cultural context. Not to speak of his pioneer effort for scholarship, all the more admirable because attained by a professional outsider and obsessed dilettante.

We come now to the question of what he did for scholarship. He was not the very first field archaeologist. But because of his organizational gifts, his ability to pay for his excavations and his growing improvement in excavation techniques, he became the real founder of field archaeology. Donald Easton of Cambridge sought to compare and synthesize the results of the excavations of Schliemann, Dörpfeld and Blegen at Troy.⁷⁶ He

⁷³ See above, note 48.

⁷⁴ W. Bölke, *Mitteilungen aus dem Heinrich-Schliemann-Museum Ankershagen*² (Ankershagen 1988).

⁷⁵ W. Bölke, "Schliemanns Kindheit in Ankershagen," in Calder and Cobet (above, note 8) 170-90.

⁷⁶ D. F. Easton, "Reconstructing Schliemann's Troy," in Calder and Cobet (above, note 8) 431-47.

showed that they fit. That is splendid proof that Schliemann's records are in large part trustworthy.

Regarding Mycenae: Since Traill's publication of Schliemann's Mycenaean diary there remains uncertainty. The authenticity of the Mask of Agamemnon is still in question. Stylistic considerations prove that the mask is not like the others found at Mycenae but are not sufficient to deny authenticity.⁷⁷ Schliemann's letter to his Parisian colleague Beaurain with the request to ask a discreet goldsmith to make exact copies of the Treasure of Priam is not an argument of sufficient cogency to question the authenticity of the mask.⁷⁸ A testing of the gold might decide the problem but the request to do so has twice been refused by the Greek Archaeological Service.⁷⁹

A further aspect of recent research concerns Schliemann's aims in editing his early travel diaries. I have already discussed the Ithaca book, the travels in China and Japan and the monster-letter of 1842 to his sisters. We should not underestimate Schliemann's ability to embroider experience. Just how far this tendency infected his scholarly publications must be more carefully investigated. One thing seems certain: his reports about his life and travels are always subject to exaggeration. Because of this Goethe's formulation, *Dichtung und Wahrheit* (*Poetry and Truth*), has long been applied to Schliemann's efforts.⁸⁰ In the introduction to Goethe's autobiography we already find the integration of the author's development as an individual with the history and culture of his age.⁸¹ There is already the need to color experience with poetic elaboration. We must allow Schliemann this if we are just to him. In the post-Goethean period the tendencies we observe in Goethe's autobiography are exaggerated so that provable falsehoods may be detected not only in Schliemann but in Richard Wagner's or Bismarck's autobiographies as well. They are not always historical in the precise sense. They contain romantic elaborations of truth. But to impose modern ideas of historical veracity upon them would be anachronistic.

At the Athens Congress I tried to establish this precisely in the cases of Wagner and Bismarck.⁸² I added the case of the railroad tycoon Henry Bethel Strousberg, whose career of business swindels often reminds us of Schliemann.

⁷⁷ See Calder (above, note 36) and "Heinrich Schliemann: Ein neues Bild," *Journal für Geschichte* (January/February 1986) 14-25.

⁷⁸ See Traill (above, note 36).

⁷⁹ See D. A. Traill in Calder and Traill (above, note 28) 140 n. 47.

⁸⁰ See, e.g., H. Stoll (ed.), *Abenteuer meines Lebens: Heinrich Schliemann erzählt*² (Leipzig 1982) 7 (St. Grunert).

⁸¹ H. Kurz (ed.), *Goethes Werke IX: Aus meinem Leben: Dichtung und Wahrheit* I (Leipzig-Wien 1910) 9 (Vorwort).

⁸² W. Schindler, "Schliemann als Zeitgenosse," *Proceedings of the Schliemann Conference at Athens* (forthcoming).

IX

In my summary I have only touched upon selected points of the new Schliemann research. Another question is the effect of Schliemann's pioneer work within archaeology. This was discussed at great length at the recent Athens conference in regard to the continuing excavations at Troy, Mycenae and Tiryns.⁸³ They were examined in the contexts of geological, topographical and other scientific points of view. In comparison with these contributions, to which may be added discussions of the dispersion of Schliemann's finds, little time was left for Schliemann the man of his time or for his publications.

The Berlin Academy of Science has planned a final Schliemann Congress for December of 1990 which will also concentrate on "The Foundations and Results of Modern Archaeology."⁸⁴ But the proposed program allows us to hope that along with the focus which is shared with Athens, the other aspects of Schliemann research, which I have discussed here, will receive their due. I find it a good omen that the pioneers of the modern critical research on Schliemann will all participate in the Berlin Conference. It guarantees that the effort to make Schliemann more historical will go forward.⁸⁵

Winckelmann-Institute der Humboldt-Universität, Berlin

⁸³ At the Athens conference three days were devoted to "The Excavations of Heinrich Schliemann." Only half a day was given to "Philological Observations." The remaining contributions were put into the last day and a half. See the program for details: *International Congress: Archaeology and Heinrich Schliemann* (Athens 1990).

⁸⁴ The Conference was entitled: "Heinrich Schliemann: Grundlagen und Ergebnisse moderner Archäologie. 100 Jahre nach Schliemanns Tod, vom 3.-6. Dezember 1990 in Berlin." The Acta are to be published in 1992.

⁸⁵ I wish to express my thanks to Professor William M. Calder III for translating my original into English and to Professor Miroslav Marcovich for publishing the paper in *Illinois Classical Studies*.

[The editors note with sorrow the death of Wolfgang Schindler in Berlin on 9 December 1991.]